DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 464 121 TM 033 802

AUTHOR Bryant, Miles; Hessel, Karen; Isernhagen, Jody
TITLE Face to Face with ISLLC: Testing Out the New School Leaders Licensure Assessment.
PUB DATE 2002-04-00
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 1-5, 2002).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrators; Certification; Content Validity; *Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; *Licensing Examinations (Professions); *Standards; *Test Construction
IDENTIFIERS *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium

ABSTRACT

Given the widespread interest in the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) School Leaders Licensure Assessment, this paper explores the implications of this type of assessment for preparation programs in educational administration. The paper examines the relationship of the six ISSLC standards to various accrediting practices as well as the use of these standards for certifying school leaders. The ISLLC examination, which is in effect a licensure examination, consists of 25 performance-based exercises organized into 4 separately-timed sections. In June 1997, a content validation study was conducted by eight principals and three university professors. The developed assessment and the vignettes and case studies of each module are described. Advocates of the ISLLC standards and the developed test suggest the School Leader Licensure Assessment as a means of assuring external stakeholders that their graduates have been educated to a satisfactory level. (Contains 20 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 464 121

Face to Face with ISLLC: Testing Out the New School Leaders Licensure Assessment

Miles Bryant
133 TEAC
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, NE 68588-0360

Karen Hessel
Educational Testing Service
Rosedale Roade
Princeton, NJ 08541

Jody Isernhagen
132 TEAC
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, NE 68588-0360

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Bryant
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

Running Head: ISLLC

A draft paper presented at the AERA 2002 National Conference,
New Orleans, LA, April 1-5, 2002

TM033802

This paper is prepared for the:
Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Face to Face with ISLLC: Testing our the New School Leaders Licensure Assessment

Introduction

The reach of the standards movement that has had a large impact on policy makers, teachers, and students (Schwartz and Robinson, 2000) has also been expanded to educational administration. Aspiring practitioners in the field of educational administration face the increasing probability that they will be required to sit for a standard national assessment in order to be licensed to hold administrative positions in school districts. Pressure for such assessments comes most forcefully from the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISSLC), a consortium of 32 education agencies and 13 education administrative associations that have a stake in representing leaders in the field of education. Established in 1994, ISLLC has the explicit goal of increasing the standards for those who would enter into the field of educational administration.

In 1996, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) published a set of standards "created by the ISSLC, a project of the CCSSO, intended to offer coherence and structure to the complex work of school leaders, at all levels of the organization" (Hessel and Holloway, 2002, p. 2). The ISSLC standards are intended to "apply to superintendents as well as site administrators" (p.2). The CCSSO is the same organization that houses the Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) that established the INTASC standards for new teachers entering the field of education.

Tannenbaum (1997) stated, "the unifying theme across all six of the (ISSLC) standards is the emphasis on promoting the success of all students" (p. 3). Upon these standards, the ISSLC in collaboration with the Educational Testing Service (ETS) has developed a performance-based licensure assessment for beginning school principals (Tannenbaum, 1997). This assessment is designed "to identify those candidates who possess the knowledge and skills believed to be important for competent, beginning-level professional practice" (Schmitt, 1995).

Given the widespread interest in the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) School Leaders Licensure Assessment, this paper explores the

implications of this type of assessment for preparation programs in educational administration. We examine the relationship of the ISSLC standards to various accrediting practices as well as the use of these standards for the purpose of certifying school leaders.

The School Leaders Licensure Standards

Hessel and Holloway (2002) indicated that the ISSLC standards were developed to redefine school leadership and to connect the framework to strategies for improving school leadership across the nation. This work "has been in the service of rebuilding or reculturing the leadership infrastructure of schooling" (p.4). Although ISSLC recognized that there were many strategies focused upon improving or upgrading school educational leadership, this consortium chose to focus on standards at the onset of their work. Hessel and Holloway (2002) indicated that this decision was influenced by the use of standards in other arenas and in the work of INTASC. These efforts convinced the consortium members that standards could appropriately lead to reform and easily be directly linked to practice. "The ISSLC standards define knowledge, performances, and dispositions that embody effective school leadership throughout the career of a school principal" (Tannenbaum, 1997, p.3).

Hessel and Holloway (2002) noted that the design of the standards by the consortium involved three approaches:

(1) heavy reliance on research focused on educational leadership and productive schools;
(2) significant trends in society and education that provide emerging views of leadership like our changing demographics, increases in poverty, and the changes in social capital; and
(3) Schooling itself requiring a redefined repertoire of leadership skills based on a redefinition of teaching and learning, and the need for community-focused and caring-centered conceptions of schooling.

Additionally, the consortium formulated an overarching set of guiding principles that aided them throughout the process. These guiding principles were:

- Standards should reflect the centrality of student learning.
- Standards should acknowledge the changing role of school leadership.
- Standards should recognize the collaborative nature of school leadership.
- Standards should be high, upgrading the quality of the profession.
- Standards should inform performance-based systems of assessment and evaluation for school leaders.

- Standards should be integrated and coherent.
- Standards should be predicated on the concepts of access, opportunity, and empowerment for all members of the school community.

(Hessel and Holloway, 2002, p. 6)

Hessel and Holloway (2002) offered the following list of the standards as they are often presented in great detail. They stated, however, that although the standards speak for themselves for the most part, missing from this list are approximately 200 indicators that help to define the standards. These indicators are clustered under three headings---knowledge, dispositions, and performances.

ISSLC Standards

Standard 1: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success for all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

Standard 2: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Standard 3: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Standard 4: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

Standard 5: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, with fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Standard 6: a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural contexts.

(Hessel and Holloway, 2002, p.7)

Hessel and Holloway (2002) reported that there is evidence that these standards are being used in a variety of ways, from ensuring greater accountability of new and current school leaders to redesigning of academic preparation programs.

The School Leaders Licensure Assessment

The current interest in educational accountability by ISSLC was the prelude for the development of a performance-based assessment. The ISSLC standards were designed for those planning to enter the field of educational administration and were developed based on beliefs about the essential components and skills necessary for successful practice. It is a major leap, however, to move from the creation of a set of general expectations to a means of measuring whether or not an individual has satisfied those expectations.

Tannenbaum (1997) stated that the "ISSLC assessment was developed through an iterative process that involved several groups of practicing school principals; a Technical Advisory Committee of measurement specialists, licensure experts, university educators, and school principals; and an Assessment Development Team of representatives from state departments of education, school principals, and ISLLC staff"(p. 3). Twenty-five performance-based exercises organized into four separately timed sections make up the assessment. Candidate responses to the exercises in each of the sections are "scored using tailored rubrics that allow for partial credit and varied, standards-relevant, approaches to addressing the teaching and learning issues raised" (Tannenbaum, 1997, p.3). The sections are:

> **Module I** Evaluation of Actions: **Section I** (1 hour): Consists of situations a beginning school principal is likely to encounter on the job. Candidates are required to write a response to the teaching and learning issues raised in each situation. Evaluation of Actions: **Section II** (1 hour): Consists of situations a beginning school principal is likely to encounter on the job. These situations are more complex than those in Section I, dealing with, for example, multiple stakeholders and conflicts of interest.
>
> **Module II** (2 hours): Presents candidates with two independent cases each presented through a series of interrelated documents. Candidates are required to synthesize the information across the documents as they write their responses to a set of questions.
>
> **Module III** (2 hours): Presents candidates with seven independent documents such as letters from parents discussing the curriculum schedules, and staff evaluations. Candidates are required to interpret and analyze the information contained in each document and to write responses to questions focusing on important teaching and learning issues. (Tannenbaum, 1997, p. 3)

This assessment has been labeled a licensure examination (Tannenbaum, 1997). Schmitt (1995) defined the purpose of a licensure assessment as a way to identify those candidates who possess the knowledge and skills believed to be important for competent, beginning level professional practice.

In June 1997, a content validation study was conducted by 11 panelists, 8 principals and 3 university educators (Tannenbaum, 1997). Tannenbaum provided detailed information about the panelists participating in the study and about the procedures followed in his study that was conducted on behalf of the CCSSO. The six funding jurisdictions, the states of Illinois, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, and North Carolina and the District of Columbia were represented on the panel. The panel makeup had representation by gender and race ethnicity, school demographics, and years of experience in school leadership or university service.

Theoretical Base: Predicting the Future and Guarding Against Failure

Hart (1999) observed that the field of educational leadership and administration has shifted from an orientation to social science based approaches to one grounded in cognitive development. The preparation of administrators has turned to the development of skills that reflect growth in cognitive development. The certification of educators as competent to serve in an administrative role has also shifted its focus to one that should be governed by national standards and not by those doing the training, i.e. the educational administration professorate (Shipman & Murphy, 2000). As indicated earlier, ISSLC is a manifestation of these changes. The SLLA, the actual assessment designed to measure an individual's knowledge of the ISLLC standards, serves as a mechanism for attesting to the quality of an individual's cognitive knowledge and her or his ability to apply that knowledge to real life situations. A less subjective model of such certification may well replace the model of quality assurance that relies on the judgment of the professor of educational administration. Furthermore, a single assessment introduces the possibility that state departments of education may come to utilize the SLLA as the measure of an administrative applicant, thus opening the door for a far wider reciprocity across state certification officers than currently exists.

In hiring individuals for positions in organizations, prior experience in a similar role has historically been an important factor. The more experience a person has the more likely she or he will be able to perform in the new role. Of course, an individual seeking a first time experience in a job has no history. Tests and psychological screening and assessment activities all have been used as proxies for job experience. Thus, for new graduates of college who want to be teachers or for the graduates of an administrative program who want to be principals, the new School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA_) assessment represents a proxy measure of competency. It is important to note that the SLLA is but one part of the total certification or licensure process. The SLLA separates those who demonstrate an understanding of the ISLLC standards from those who do not. And, the ISSLC standards, of course, have been created as the ideal knowledge, dispositions, and behaviors characterizing best practice as an administrator.

The use of a test or assessment as a means of predicting future behavior has a long history in the social sciences. The SAT, the GRE, the ACT, the MCAT, the LSAT are all examples of a test used by educational organizations as a means of guessing about the future performance of students. Many other forms of assessment have been used to predict future performance. We use such assessments to help us increase the probability that an individual will be successful in a future role. We assume that the more competent an individual appears at one point in time the more competently that same individual will perform at a later point in time. The SLLA exam is used for entry level beginning practice and seeks to capture an individual's knowledge of the standards. In this sense, the SLLA does not purport to predict future performance although some may seek to do this with the results of SLLA examinations.

The SLLA has probably not yet been used in sufficient numbers to build a large database by which its validity as a licensing instrument can be measured, although its use has increased substantially since its inception. Murphy (2000) and others involved in the creation of the national standards argued that it is a valid measure of assessment. By way of contrast, Mehrens (1987) thought that a license assessment could not predict who would or would not be a successful practitioner. Others, most notably Fenwick (2000) find the ISSLC standards ambiguous and epistemologically flawed.

Actual efforts to examine how well ISLLC predicts future performance are sparse. McCowan et al. (2000) reported data from 146 principals who had taken the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA). These principals were all on the job and were rated by their superintendents according to their strengths in the six areas of the ISSLC. Likert scale responses were used. Inexplicably the researchers report no correlation between the examination and the job performance ratings. They do report mean Likert scale data for the superintendent's assessment and all are reported to function well above the mean of 3.5 on all of the SLLA assessments. Of course, superintendents are likely to rate highly the principals that they nominated as successful principals.

Coutts (1997) examined the same issue with ISSLC standards from the opposite perspective. If one can identify principals that fail, does the SLLA assessment predict that they would fail? This study also comes up short methodologically. Superintendents were asked to identify principals that had been removed from office and to rate these individuals using the SLLA assessments. Not surprisingly, these superintendents perceived the individuals whom they had fired as not living up to ISSLC standards. Again, what is missing is any objective measure of cognitive and performance ability that could be correlated with on the job ratings. This is not too surprising. It is difficult to devise a means of predicting future job performance as indicated earlier.

When we apply this reasoning to the arena of educational administration, we immediately face a major issue. School administration at any level is full of complexity (Shipman & Murphy, 2000, p. 99). Context is everything. What the future administrative educator is taught in her or his program may be of peripheral importance to on the job experiences. Indeed, training programs can even lead to what Veblen referred to as a trained incapacity (Bridges, 1977). What we learn comes to handicap us because the situation in which we find ourselves calls for some sort of new learning, not what we learned as applied to a previous situation.

Furthermore, past learning and preparation is not the only issue that may compromise administrative performance. The job is extremely stressful. Any person, even the most competent and skilled, can falter under pressure. Research on how extremely gifted individuals can choke or panic in the face of pressure implies that even the most thoroughly skilled administrator may, at times, fail to perform adequately under

certain kinds of pressure (Gladwell, 2000). Faced with ambiguous and threatening decisions, even an expert administrator may "choke" or "panic", forsaking the almost instinctual responses to crises that have guided the performance in the past. Predicting the quality of future performance is, for many reasons, a risky enterprise.

Still, predicting future performance has often been a part of the landscape of leadership preparation. The Ohio State studies of the 50s (Halpin, 1956) and the University of Michigan studies of that same era (Likert, 1961) are celebrated examples of efforts to predict future performance. There are literally hundreds of paper and pencil instruments one can use to capture one's leadership attributes. And there have been other more innovative ways to assess present talents. One of the more prominent of these in educational settings was the NASSP's Assessment Center process that attempted to measure a person's ability using behavioral simulations. These elaborate behavioral simulations provided a wealth of information but was extremely labor intensive and useful for formative assessment (Wendel, 1988). Use of the Assessment Center as a high stakes test never took hold in part because it was too time intensive and perhaps because it simply didn't predict future performance very well (Bryant, 1990).

These approaches to measuring an individual's ability or attributes at one point in time in order to guess at that same individual's probable performance at a future point in time have long been seen as a desirable component to any professional training program. This task of devising a way to measure knowledge and skills in educational administration believed to be important for competent level beginning practice is, of course, precisely the challenge taken on by ISSLC and implemented by Educational Testing Service. ISLLC can be understood as an effort to do just that--to make sure that those educators who assume leadership positions in schools have the abilities to lead.

> *They (the ISLLIC standards) represent another part of a concerted effort to enhance the skills of school leaders and to couple leadership with effective educational processes and valued outcomes. (Shipman & Murphy, 2000).*

In helping educators to be prepared for the ambiguous world of educational administration, the curricula of preparation programs has long made use of case studies as a pedagogical tool. One of the attractive aspects of the case study is that it provides a

mechanism to mimic the complexity of the administrative environment. When rich in detail and nuance, a case provides for the same kind of multiple interpretations of data that confront the educational administrator when s/he is on the job for real.

It is a reasonable argument, as made by Sharp, Walter, & Sharp (1998), that when a student wrestles with a number of rich case studies, she or he is more likely to be sensitive to multiple interpretations and varied administrative actions. If this is so, then case studies logically serve to prepare the individual for a future role as an administrator. Furthermore, an ability to deal with the complexity of a case study may be understood as an indication that one will be able to deal with the complexity of the job.

This is the premise of the ISLLC test.

The School Leaders Licensure Assessment Illustrated

We now turn to a series of actual vignettes that form the basis for Module 1 Evaluation of Actions in the ISLLC assessment of administrative skills and behaviors. The first module consists of two separate one-hour sections. Each section is timed separately.

Evaluation of Actions: Section I consists of 10 short vignettes. Each describes a situation the principal might commonly encounter and be required to respond to. Each vignette is followed by a focused question that asks what the principal might do next, what factors the principal should consider in responding to the situation, how the principal might handle the situation or dilemma presented, or what the potential consequences of the action in the situation are. The test taker is required to answer the question with specific detail and to give a rationale or the answer when appropriate. This category includes vignettes that deal with situations drawn from and distributed among such content areas as due process and other legal issues, exceptional needs students, safety, facilities, budget, discipline, technology and scheduling,

The following is an example of one of the small vignettes, with sample responses, at the three score points, for **Evaluation of Actions: Section I.**

> It is early December and the students in an elementary school are practicing for the annual holiday concert. A parent phones the school to insist that her child not be required to sing any of the Christmas songs. The principal excuses the student from participation in the music practice.

Do you agree with the principal's action? Give a rationale, citing factors that are relevant to a principal's decisions in such situations.

The following are actual responses given by principal candidates to the sample exercise.

Sample response 1 Score 2

"Yes, I agree with the principal's actions. First of all, parents have the rights related to religious issues, and since this is a "holiday" concert, the principal should be sensitive to the parents concerns. I think the principal should also ask the teachers to examine the program carefully, to be sure it is not advocating one religion or that it would not be offensive to any group of students. Also, perhaps the principal should suggest an alternative activity for the student so the student will not feel left out."

Commentary: The response identifies the parent's/student's rights, suggests an examination of the content of the concert to determine appropriateness for all students, and suggests finding an alternative activity for the student.

In order to achieve a **score of 2**, the response specifically cites the civil and/or religious rights of the parent/student, and includes at least one of the following:

- meeting with the parent and student to discuss the objections

- suggesting some alternative activity for the student
- examining the content of the concert to determine its appropriateness for all students.

Sample response 2 Score 1

"The parent has the legal right to have the child removed from the activity if the content is objectionable from a religious point of view. Although I might want the parent to go ahead and allow the student to be involved, I would honor the parent's right to have the student excluded."

Commentary: The response acknowledges the parent's/student's rights, but does not suggest any of the three suggested actions to deal with the situation fully.

In order to achieve a **score of 1**, the response specifically cites one of the following:

- the civil and or religious rights of the parent/student
- meeting with the parent and student to discuss the objections
- suggesting some sort of alternative activity
- examining the content of the concert to determine its appropriateness for all students.

Sample 3 SCORE 0

"The principal did the right thing. The principal has to rely on the public, and especially the parents, for support for the school. If the principal does not go along with the parent, the parent may turn against the principal and school, and may even get others to do the same thing. So for political reasons, it is the right thing to do."

Commentary: The response omits reference to any of the essential factors – the parent's/student's rights, a meeting with the parent and student, the suggestion of an alternative activity, or a review of the content of the concert.

In order to **score 0,** the response is vague and omits any reference to the essential features.

Evaluation of Actions: Section II contains six longer vignettes. Each presents a dilemma based on teaching and learning issues. The test taker is asked a focused analytical question. The response requires the test taker to balance competing claims for resources, prioritize actions, articulate the instructional issues raised by the situation, explain instructional and curricular strategies appropriate in responding to the situation, and discuss the situation's instructional implications.

The following is an example of one of the larger vignettes from **Section II of Module 1**.

> In March a high school senior presents a letter from his mother requesting, contrary to the school policy that he be allowed to drop physics, because he is failing the class. He is also failing several other classes, but does not need to pass physics to graduate. The principal consults with the teachers and with the students counselor. They all concur that the student could be passing all his courses, including physics, if he worked harder. However, the principal persuaded by the parent's argument, that the stress of physics is adversely affecting her son, authorizes the student to drop the course.

Evaluate the principal's actions from the point of view of teaching and learning.

Sample 1 Score 2

"I would concur with the principal's decision as being in the child's best interests. However, I would want to set up an action plan with the student, parents, teachers and counselor regarding his approach to school. Since he has the ability to pass, why isn't he? I would want to investigate this with all concerned, in order to help the student think about himself as a learner. I would replace the physics period with an assigned study hall monitored by one of his teachers or counselor. The student would be responsible for gathering all the work he needs to complete to pass the other classes and work on these

materials during the study hall. A teacher or counselor will assist the student in planning out this work and methodically completing it. The student would need to complete all the other class requirements and raise his grades to passing levels in order to graduate. I would work with the student and the parent to work out a contract to this effect as part of the agreement that he will drop physics.

I would also want the counselor to work with the student on his mental attitude. There could be many reasons why he is doing so poorly, and these should be addressed. The parent might also want to hire a tutor in any area that is giving the student specific trouble. Student attendance would also have to be regular and punctual."

Commentary: The response clearly presents a plan that is in the best interest of the student, that involves the parent and the student in facing and solving the problem, and that involves appropriate staff members in analyzing and solving the problem.

In order to achieve a **score of 2**, the candidate's response must be primarily concerned with what is in the best interest of this particular student. In addition, the response cites any two of the following:

- conferencing with the parent who may have essential information about the student
- conferencing with the student to help the student confront and begin to solve the problem
- involving other appropriate staff members to address possible causes/reasons for failure
- generating a plan of action that will provide support to the student
- working toward parent/student cooperation with the school, and their acceptance of responsibility for achieving passing grades in all other courses.

Sample Response 2 Score 1

"The principal's response of letting the student "bail out" is acceptable. However, the principal should make a plan so that the student will improve his performance in the

remaining classes. Or, the principal might suggest an alternate way for the student to get credit for physics – perhaps an independent project approach with a pass/fail grade. A compromise might be struck to insure a win/win rather than a win/lose or lose/lose approach."

Commentary: The response suggests a plan that is in the best interest of the student. However, the response is limited in that it does not suggest involving the parents and teachers or counselors to get more information, and it does not address the need for the parent and student to accept responsibility.

A response that receives a **score-point of 1** is supportive of what is in the best interest of the particular student and cites any one of the bullets listed above in the 2 response criteria.

Sample Response Score 0

"The principal's action is wrong. The student has the ability to pass not only physics but also his other classes. Much more is learned in high school than the academics. Failure to apply yourself in your senior year can result in failure of courses. If this student is allowed to graduate, the lesson he will learn is that he doesn't have to accept the consequences for his actions."

Commentary: The response does not reflect the ISLLC Standards and fails to suggest a supportive approach to the problem. The response does not suggest a plan to help the student, does not involve the parents or faculty in addressing the problem, and does not work toward parent and student cooperation with the school.

A **0 response** is vague, or omits reference to any of the essential factors.

ETS has developed additional assessments of a person's knowledge of the ISLLC standards. Modules II and III in the School Leader Licensure Assessment are two hours long and involve Synthesis of Information and Problem Solving and Analysis of

Information and Decision-Making. Samples of these items would be too large to include in this paper. However, examples of these items can be found in the School Leadership Series Tests at a Glance (TAAG) available from Educational Testing Service at no charge.

A brief explanation of Module II and III follows. Module II consists of two one-hour case analyses. Each case is anchored in issues of learning and teaching. For each case, candidates are presented with a set of documents. Candidates are also given a short scenario describing a school and its community. They are required to examine the documents and select from these documents relevant information to answer questions that pose complex problems and require the candidate to propose a courses of action to address the problems. One set of documents is relevant to an elementary school setting, and the other is relevant to a middle school or high school setting.

In Module III, candidates are presented with seven documents typical of those encountered by school administrators. At least six of the seven documents relate to issues involving learning and teaching. Using the information in each document, the candidate responds to two questions about the document. The types of documents used in this module may include;

- assessment data
- portions of school improvement plans
- budget information
- schedules
- resource allocation documents
- staff evaluation
- curriculum information.

The types of questions may include:

- What is the important issue in the date presented in this document?
- What other information would you need to assess the information presented in the document?
- Where would you get such information?
- What important patterns do you observe in the data presented in the document?

- What steps would you take with your staff to address the issues raised by the data presented in the document?
- How would you present the information contained in this document to parents, community organizations, staff, etc.?

Scoring the Assessments

School leaders who have been carefully trained in the ISLLC Standards and the content specifications for the assessment score all of the exercises in the SLLA. Scorers are trained to make distinctions among responses according to scoring rubrics, or guides, developed for each exercise. Prior to determining the score for any test taker, scorers examine, discuss and practice scoring many sample responses, guided by a trainer who is very familiar with the assessment and with test takers' responses. All exercises are tried out and pre-tested responses carefully analyzed before exercises are used in an operational form of the assessment. The responses to the pretest questions serve as a basis for determining the clarity and soundness of the exercise, as well as for articulating the preliminary scoring rubric for each exercise. The ISLLC Standards detail the particular values and the vision of effective practice that will guide and shape the scoring of these exercises.

In this era of accountability, the idea of an adoption of this national set of standards for school leaders is well timed. Presently over 30 states have adopted or adapted the ISLLC Standards for school leaders, although not all are using the SLLA as an instrument in part of their certification process. The articulation of a set of standards that focusing on instructional leadership and success for all students appears to have struck a responsive chord with policy makers in many states.

Significance

Professors working in departments of educational leadership and administration will, if they have not already, encounter advocates of the ISLLC standards and the use of ISLLC instruments, including the School Leader Licensure Assessment as a means of assuring external stakeholders that their graduates have been educated to a satisfactory

level. Many advocate that the use of an external assessment of this sort should drive the curriculum of such educational administration departments. Efforts to align NCATE standards, assessments, and curricular content may move the field in such directions. Professors of educational leadership need to be informed about the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards and the utility of such assessments as a matter of informing their students accurately about the potential necessity of participating in ISLLC types of activities or the expectations that state departments and districts have for the types of school leaders they desire to hire.

It is also true that in some states where schools are having trouble filling administrative vacancies with qualified leaders, the SLLA and other forms of discriminating among applicants may present too high a bar. If so, the various forms of certification that rely on professors of Educational Administration as the agent of accountability may well continue.

References

Bridges, E. (1977). "Becoming unfit by being fit for an unfit fitness" In L. Cunningham, W. Hack, & R. Nystrand (Eds.) Educational Administration.

Bryant, M. (1990). A study of administrative expertise in participant performance on the NASSP Assessment Center. Journal of Personnel Evaluation, 3, 353-363.

Coutts, J.D., (1997). Why principals fail: Are national professional standards valid measures of principal performance. ERS Spectrum, Fall.

Gladwell, M. (2000). The art of Failure: Why some people choke and others panic. The New Yorker, August 21 & 28, 84-92.

Hart, A. (1999). Educational leadership: A field of inquiry and practice. Educational Management and Administration. 27(3), p 323-334.

Halpin, A. (1956). The leader behavior of school superintendents. Columbus, OH: College of Education, Ohio State University.

Hessel, K. & Holloway, J. (2002). A framework for school leaders: Linking the ISSLC standards to practice. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Kochan, F. & Spencer, W. (1999). Preparing leaders for tomorrow's schools: The practitioner's perspectives. Research in the Schools, 6(1) p. 9-16.

Lashway, L. (1998). Standards for administrators. Research Roundup 15 (1), 21-3.

Likert, R. (1961). New Patterns of Management and Value. New York: McGraw Hill.

McCowan, Arnold, M., Miles, D, & Hargadine, K. (2000). Why principals succeed: Comparing principal performance to national professional standards. ERS Spectrum, 18 (2), 14-19.

McFadden, A. (2001). The professor takes the test: The school leaders licensure assessment experience.

Mehrens, W.A. (1987). Validity issues in teacher licensure tests. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 1, 195-229.

Murphy, J. & Shipman, N. (1998). The interstate school leaders licensure consortium: A standards-based approach to strengthening educational leadership. ERIC Documents. ED420698.

Schmitt, K. (1995). What is licensure? In J. C. Impara (Ed.), Licensure testing: Purposes, procedures, and practices (pp. 3-32). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.

Schwartz, R. & Robinson, M. (2000). Goals 2000 and the standards movement. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Sharp,W, Walter, J.K. & Sharp H. (1998). Case studies for school leaders implementing the ISLLC standards. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing.

Standards for School Leaders. (2001). Interstate school leaders licensure consortium. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Tannenbaum, R. (1997). Content validation of the interstate school leaders licensure consortium School Leaders Licensure Assessment. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. .

Wendel, F. (1988). Implications of assessment center methodology for preparation programs in educational administration. Arizona State University: UCEA Monograph Series.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

TM033802

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Face to Face with ISLLC: Testing out the new School Leaders Licensure Assessment	
Author(s): Miles Bryant, Karen Hessel, Jody Isernhagen	
Corporate Source: University of Nebraska	Publication Date: 4/1/02

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Miles Bryant	Printed Name/Position/Title: Miles Bryant, Assoc. Prof
Organization/Address: 133 TEAC, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE 68588-0360	Telephone: 402-477-9603 FAX: 402-472-4800
	E-Mail Address: mbryant1@unl.edu Date: 3/26/02

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)